



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/545,396	04/07/2000	Robert Seliger	S1389/7008 GSe	2452

7590 04/21/2004

Gary S Engelson
Wolf Greenfield & Sacks P C
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, MA 02210

EXAMINER

JACOBS, LASHONDA T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2004

17

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/545,396

Applicant(s)

SELIGER ET AL.

Examiner

LaShonda T. Jacobs

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 14.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to Applicants' amendment filed on January 28, 2004. Claims 1-22 are presented for further examination. Claims 23-32 newly added by Applicants' are also presented for examination

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United states before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371 (c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

2. Claims 1, 4-8, 15-18, 23-26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gopal et al. (hereinafter, "Gopal", 5,491,817).

As per claim 1, Gopal discloses at least one computer readable medium encoded with a program that, when executed, performs a method of administering a context management system that manages a context, the method comprising:

- configuring a subject data definition which defines a subject in the context using subject data that comprises a data item usable by a plurality of applications comprising at least a first application (linking application) and a second application (linking application), the data item having a set of values (linking identifiers) comprising at least a first value corresponding to the first application and a second value corresponding to the second application, the et of values identifying the subject in the context, the value of the data

Art Unit: 2157

item corresponding to the first application being exchangeable with the value of the data item corresponding to the second application when a users switches from the first application to the second application to retain the context (abstract, col. 5, lines 44-67, col. 6, lines 1-13, col. 8, lines 6-23, lines 58-67, col. 9, lines 59-67 and col. 10, lines 1-13).

As per claim 4, Gopal further discloses:

- maintaining in a subject data definition, which applications are allowed to access the subject (abstract, col. 5, lines 44-67, col. 6, lines 1-13, col. 8, lines 6-23, lines 58-67, col. 9, lines 59-67 and col. 10, lines 1-13).

As per claim 5, Gopal further discloses:

- storing with each application a value which is a function of but not equal to the passcode for the application (abstract, col. 5, lines 44-67 and col. 6, lines 46-47)).

As per claim 6, Gopal further discloses:

- encrypting the passcode to form the value (col. 6, lines 46-47).

As per claim 7, Gopal further discloses:

- maintaining an inventory of applications whose context is managed (abstract, col. 7, lines 65-67 and col. 8, lines 1-23).

As per claim 8, Gopal further discloses:

- maintaining a map relating User IDs to login identifiers formatted for each application in the inventory (col. 8, lines 24-45).

As per claim 15, Gopal further discloses:

Art Unit: 2157

- communicating with a context manager using a hypertext transport protocol (col. 8, lines 24-34).

As per claim 16, Gopal discloses:

- wherein the hypertext transport protocol is HTTP 1.1 (col. 7, lines 44-50).

As per claim 17, Gopal discloses an apparatus comprising:

- at least one processor programmed to manage and administer a context, the at least one processor programmed to implement (col. 8, lines 24-45);
- a context manager (col. 8, lines 24-45); and
- an administration suite for configuring a subject data definition which defines a subject in the context using subject data that comprises a data item usable by a plurality of applications comprising at least a first application and a second application, the data item having a set of values comprising at least a first value corresponding to the first application and a second value corresponding to the second application, the set of values identifying the subject in the context, the value of the data item corresponding to the first application being exchangeable with the value of the data item corresponding to the second application when a user switches from the first application to the second application to retain the context (abstract, col. 5, lines 44-67, col. 6, lines 1-13, col. 8, lines 6-23, lines 58-67, col. 9, lines 59-67 and col. 10, lines 1-13).

As per claim 18, Gopal discloses wherein the administration suite further comprises:

- a context administrator (col. 8, lines 24-45); and
- a context server (col. 8, lines 24-45).

As per claim 23, Gopal discloses wherein the at least one processor comprises:

Art Unit: 2157

- a single processor programmed to implement the context manager and the administration suite (col. 8, lines 24-45).

As per claim **24**, Gopal discloses wherein the at least one processor comprises:

- at least a first processor programmed to implement the context manager and at least a second processor programmed to implement the administration suite (col. 8, lines 24-45).

As per claim **25**, Gopal discloses:

- wherein the at least one processor is programmed so that the administration suite generates a log which includes information received from the context manager (col. 8, lines 24-45, lines 58-67, col. 9, lines 59-67 and col. 10, lines 1-13).

As per claim **26**, Gopal discloses:

- wherein the log comprises an indication of a processing exception observed by the context manager (col. 8, lines 24-45, lines 58-67, col. 9, lines 59-67 and col. 10, lines 1-13).

As per claim **28**, Gopal discloses:

- wherein the at least processor is programmed so that the administration suite generates an inventory which includes the context manager (col. 8, lines 24-45).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

Art Unit: 2157

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims **2-3, 9-14, 27** and **29-32** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gopal in view of Smith et al (hereinafter, "Smith", 6,064,973).

As per claim **2**, Gopal discloses the claimed invention substantially as claimed.

However, Gopal fails to explicitly disclose:

- identifying one or more available context managers to administer.

Smith discloses:

- identifying one or more available context managers to administer (col. 14, lines 5-14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Gopal and Smith by identifying one or more available context managers to administer because this would allow each manager to deliver different functionalities to end users.

As per claim **3**, Gopal discloses the claimed invention substantially as claimed.

However, Gopal fails to explicitly disclose:

- pinging possible context manager addresses to find the available context managers.

Smith discloses:

- pinging possible context manager addresses to find the available context managers (at least implicitly)(col. 14, lines 43-53).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Gopal and Smith by pinging possible context manager addresses to find the available context managers because this would allow context managers to deliver different functionalities to users in timely and efficiently manner.

Art Unit: 2157

As per claim 9, Gopal discloses the claimed invention substantially as claimed.

However, Hayes fails to explicitly disclose:

- configuring communication parameters for the available context managers.

Smith discloses:

- configuring communication parameters for the available context managers (col. 14, lines 28-37).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Gopal and Smith by configuring communications parameters for the available context managers allowing context managers to communicate with the users.

As per claim 10, Gopal discloses the claimed invention substantially as claimed.

However, Gopal fails to explicitly disclose:

- generating a status report for the system.

Smith discloses:

- generating a status report for the system (col. 15, lines 5-16).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Gopal and Smith generating a status report for the system because the would allow the administrator to view information processed on the system.

As per claim 11, Gopal discloses the claimed invention substantially as claimed.

However, Gopal fails to explicitly disclose:

- intervening in a context management process.

Art Unit: 2157

Smith discloses:

- intervening in a context management process (col.14, lines 28-42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Gopal and Smith by intervening in a context management process allowing an administrator to stop a process for any reason.

As per claim **12**, Gopal discloses the claimed invention substantially as claimed.

However, Gopal fails to explicitly disclose:

- forcing an application out of a context.

Smith discloses:

- forcing an application out of a context (col.14, lines 54-62).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Gopal and Smith by forcing an application out of a context because this would preserve data integrity of the objects.

As per claim **13**, Gopal discloses the claimed invention substantially as claimed.

However, Gopal fails to explicitly disclose:

- canceling a transaction in progress.

Smith discloses:

- canceling a transaction in progress (col.15, lines 17-25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Gopal and Smith by canceling a transaction in progress because this would preserve data integrity of the objects.

As per claim **14**, Gopal discloses the claimed invention substantially as claimed.

Art Unit: 2157

However, Gopal fails to explicitly disclose:

- shutting down a context manager.

Smith discloses:

- shutting down a context manager (col.15, lines 17-31).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Gopal and Smith by shutting down a context manager allowing the context manager not deliver functionalities to the user.

As per claims **27** and **31**, Gopal discloses:

- wherein the at least one processor s programmed so that the administration suite, subsequent to configuring the subject data definition, reconfigures the subject data definition and communicates the reconfiguration of the subject data definition to the content manager (abstract, col. 5, lines 44-67, col. 6, lines 1-13, col. 8, lines 6-23, lines 58-67, col. 9, lines 59-67 and col. 10, lines 1-13).

As per claim **29**, Gopal further discloses:

- generating a log which includes information received from at least one of the available context managers (col. 8, lines 24-45, lines 58-67, col. 9, lines 59-67 and col. 10, lines 1-13).

As per claim **30**, Gopal discloses:

- wherein the act of generating the log comprises generating a log which includes an indication of a processing exception observed by the at least one of the available context managers (col. 8, lines 24-45, lines 58-67, col. 9, lines 59-67 and col. 10, lines 1-13).

As per claim **32**, Gopal further discloses:

Art Unit: 2157

- generating an inventory of the available context managers to administer (col. 8, lines 24-45, lines 58-67, col. 9, lines 59-67 and col. 10, lines 1-13).

5. Claims **19-22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gopal in view of Cox et al (hereinafter, "Cox", 6,510,466).

As per claim **19**, Gopal discloses wherein the context server further comprises:

- a passcode service (col. 8, lines 45-59); and
- a user mapping agent (UMA) service (col. 6, lines 20-30, col. 11, lines 13-23, and col. 13, lines 25-33).

However, Gopal fails to explicitly disclose:

- a lightweight directory access protocol (LDAP) service.

Cox discloses:

- a lightweight directory access protocol (LDAP) service (col. 10, lines 16-22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Gopal and Cox to incorporate a lightweight directory access protocol service allowing directory based information to be shared across operating systems.

As per claim **20**, Gopal discloses the claimed invention substantially as claimed.

However, Gopal fails to explicitly disclose:

- wherein the LDAP service further comprises a data storage module in which the passcode service stores encrypted passcodes and in which the user mapping agent service stores user-mapping data.

Art Unit: 2157

Cox discloses:

- wherein the LDAP service further comprises a data storage module in which the passcode service stores encrypted passcodes and in which the user mapping agent service stores user-mapping data (col. 10, lines 16-43).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Gopal and Cox to incorporate a data storage module in which the passcode service stores encrypted passcodes and in which the user mapping agent service stores user-mapping data allowing authenticated users to access software applications.

As per claim **21**, Gopal discloses the claimed invention substantially as claimed.

However, Gopal fails to explicitly disclose:

- a registry in which the context manager is registered.

Cox discloses:

- a registry in which the context manager is registered (col. 4, lines 10-38, and col. 10, lines 16-22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Gopal and Cox to incorporate a registry in which the context manager is registered allowing context managers to register other new context managers on the network.

As per claim **22**, Gopal discloses the claimed invention substantially as claimed.

However, Hayes fails to explicitly disclose:

Art Unit: 2157

- wherein the context server further comprises configuration memory holding a common configuration used as a default configuration for the context manager.

Cox discloses:

- wherein the context server further comprises configuration memory holding a common configuration used as a default configuration for the context manager (col.8, lines 23-32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Gopal and Cox to incorporate configuration memory holding a common configuration used as a default configuration for the context manager allowing the context manager to use the default configuration when connecting to the network.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LaShonda T. Jacobs whose telephone number is 703-305-7494.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 703-308-7562. The fax phone numbers for the


Art Unit: 2157

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

LaShonda T. Jacobs
Examiner
Art Unit 2157

ltj
April 15, 2004


ARJO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100